

## **Updates on 7<sup>th</sup> Year Reports from the 2009-10 Accreditation Site Visit Reports**

### **Overview of this Report**

This item presents information provided by institutions for which COA had requested a 7<sup>th</sup> year report.

### **Staff recommendation**

This item is for information only.

### **Background**

The accreditation system allows the COA to request a 7<sup>th</sup> year report from any institution. In cases where the institution receives stipulations, their 7<sup>th</sup> year report is essentially the same as their response to the stipulations. However, the COA may request institutions receiving **Accreditation** to also provide a 7<sup>th</sup> year report. These reports typically are requested where there are one or more Common or program standard less than fully met. These reports require no action by the COA, however, they do provide some assurance that the institution is taking steps to ensure alignment with all standards.

For the 2009-10 accreditation year, two institutions were granted the accreditation status of Accreditation with a request by COA that they submit a 7<sup>th</sup> year report. These institutions are Biola University and Touro University. Both institutions complied with the request in a timely manner. Information is provided here for both institutions. Commission consultants who were assigned to the visits in 2009-10 will be available to answer questions from the COA on the information provided.

### **Biola University**

An accreditation decision of *Accreditation* was granted to Biola following its April 11-14, 2010 accreditation visit (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2010-06/2010-06-item-15.pdf>). The team found three standards that were met with concerns during the visit and Biola was asked to provide evidence in its seventh year report describing activities and actions the institution has taken to meet standards that were found to be less than fully met. Following are summaries of the team findings and the Biola response.

### **2010 Team Findings**

The team found Common Standard 3, Resources, met with concerns. The team identified concerns about the breadth of responsibilities currently handled by the Undergraduate Chair/Director of Teacher Education. Additionally, there were concerns about the work load associated with the field experience coordinator position and the need for additional resources for single subject programs. The team also noted concerns about sufficient content-specific pedagogy for single subject candidates and the level of support for single subject programs.

## **Biola Response**

As a result of the CTC visit, the Biola School of Education has received a one-time adjustment of \$94,239 to fund ongoing program support and program growth, including the addition of a full-time tenure-track professor, student teacher support, university supervisors, and multiple and single subject specific pedagogy coursework. Additionally, beginning with the 2011-2012 fiscal year, permanent funds have been added to the budget to address both growth of the School of Education and the specific concerns identified by the accreditation team. The additional funds will provide support for the Director of Teacher Education through a new full-time faculty position as Director of Elementary Education and resources to support the field coordinator position and single subject programs.

## **2010 Team Findings**

The team found two program standards, Standard 8B, Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction by Single Subject Candidates, and Standard 10, Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning, met with concerns.

For both Standard 8B and Standard 10, the team found that the review of documents and interviews with candidates did not elicit clear and obvious examples of how some elements of the standards are being addressed and learned. The team noted that there was some evidence that elements of the standard are introduced in lectures, readings, and discussions but candidates were not able to articulate knowledge or recognition of some issues, for example, knowledge of parents' rights, communication with families, substance abuse, conflict resolution, and service agencies that offer support for the development of a healthy learning community.

## **Biola Response (Standard 8B)**

Biola will continue to require core coursework devoted to methods for teaching at the secondary level as well as integrating content area instructional strategies into coursework. New measures have been successfully implemented to address candidates' level of preparation to teach subject area content. Candidates began to complete the courses in spring 2010. The Single Subject pedagogy courses were first completed in spring 2011. Single Subject course lectures and activities will take place on a local high school campus simultaneously with the corresponding required fieldwork on the same campus, providing candidates access to high-quality subject specific pedagogy in secondary content areas. Biola reports that it will continue to gather data on candidate performance and the data will be available and reported in the next Biennial Report.

## **Biola Response (Standard 10)**

Activities to address Standard 10 concerns began in fall 2010 with review of course content and the degree to which each element of Standard 10 is embedded in the courses. Faculty members reviewed the data and collaborated on ways to integrate and improve the depth of Standard 10 content coverage and assessment of each element of standard within the program. Elements that had less than adequate coverage were strengthened within the courses. Emphasis was given to providing candidates with opportunities to both study and be assessed on their ability to articulate their knowledge through written assignments, group presentations and reflections on fieldwork experiences. This new course content was implemented as of the 2010-2011 academic year.

## **Touro University**

An accreditation decision of *Accreditation* was granted to Touro University California following its April 25-28, 2010 accreditation visit. <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/coa-agendas/2010-06/2010-06-item-07.pdf>. The team found two Common Standards and three Program Standards in the Education Specialist program that were met with concerns during the visit and Touro University was asked to provide evidence in a seventh year report describing activities and actions the institution has taken to meet standards that were found to be less than fully met. Following are summaries of the team findings and Touro University's Graduate School of Education's (GSOE) response.

### **2010 Team Findings for Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**

The team verified that Touro University has identified the design, the process, the timelines and tools to create a new unit and program assessment and evaluation system. They have hired a Director of Institutional Research and a staff person to input data into the newly established File Maker Pro database. This structure, along with TaskStream, will more efficiently provide the programs with data-driven outcomes that will inform ongoing unit program improvement. Given that the College of Education has been in the midst of major changes in many components of the teacher preparation programs, the team determined after very extensive review of evidence that additional evidence is needed to demonstrate the new assessment system is fully operational. Therefore, this standard was Met with Concerns.

### **Touro Response**

Samples of various surveys and assessment analyses were provided to CTC to document the following:

1. FileMaker Pro has been populated with assessment data.
2. Program chairs are required to submit assessments reports to the dean each November and April.
3. End of program, alumni, and employer surveys have been updated, correlated to key indicators, and loaded into Survey Monkey.
4. Timelines and activities for reviewing student data by program chairs and adjunct faculty members are in place.
5. Taskstream portfolios and assessment systems are now planned and created.

The GSOE has developed protocols around data collection and evaluation. These occur in many ways. A complete and comprehensive FileMaker Pro database has been developed and populated with key data for unit, program and student assessment and evaluation. Within the FileMaker Pro database, there are student information screens, advising sheets, class progression, credential and degree requirements. However, of note, are the pages dedicated to student assessment and scores on key assignments. Although the key assessments are different for each credential program, they are all tied to CTC program and common standards and the WASC Institutional Learning

Objectives (ISLO). As a result, programs are evaluated and reviewed both together and separately by program.

Assessment data is reviewed and collected often. As students progress through their programs and coursework, key assignments are scored and reviewed by each program on a weekly basis. The GSOE has a process for looking at data from a micro to macro perspective. The Dean of the College of Education and Health Sciences requires an assessment and evaluation report each November and April from each credential program. This report is modeled after the biennial reports which are required by the CTC. Not only is assessment data shared, but a written analysis of the data must accompany each report in order to “close the loop” on the data. This report details scores on key assignments and is placed into FileMaker Pro. Correlated with the timing of this report, at the beginning of each semester program, chairs meet with their adjunct faculty to review assessment and course evaluation data. Program chairs are required to meet one-to-one with the dean to review and discuss the findings of reports and assessment activities. Along with the data and analysis from the report, the faculty review course and instructor evaluations. The faculty look for trends and areas of concern and plan instruction and next steps for each program. Data collection and assessment strategies are reviewed monthly at program chair meetings. All of these routines and protocols create alignment in regards to data collection within the GSOE.

### **2010 Team Findings for Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**

The team determined that while the institution has begun to implement a new assessment and evaluation system, evidence did not clearly identify indicators common to all programs and/or those specifically identified for each program that will provide the Unit with consistent, reliable assessment data. Therefore, Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence was Met with Concerns.

### **Touro Response**

Tables and various attachments documented the following:

The response to Standard 2 included elements of Standard 9, especially in regards to common and program specific assessment data, however this response will target the cyclical and summative evaluation process at Touro University California’s Graduate School of Education. As students progress through their programs, they are given the support to master the CTC performance standards of each credential program which includes multiple opportunities to learn, observe, reflect, implement, adjust, and master all standards. Internal and external evaluators are also used to assure consistency and validity of its summative assessments, exit activities and data analysis.

In regards to this standard, the following has occurred:

1. The use of electronic portfolios and Taskstream has been implemented in every credential program.
2. Four-point rubrics have been established in every key assignment and exit portfolio activity. These rubrics are shared with students from the beginning of the program, and the exit expectations are shared with students during the interview process.

3. There has been supplementary training with adjunct faculty in the use of rubrics and the summative expectations of the CTC. The GSOE is more consistently bringing in external evaluators, such as teachers and administrators who have no affiliation to Touro University California or candidates, to review exit portfolios and presentations.
4. Field work has been more closely aligned to the summative evaluation process.
5. Summative data is reviewed together and separately by program.
6. A standards-based approach is at the core of each credential program. Each teaching and administrative program standard is taught, reflected on, and applied in numerous setting throughout each program. Just as the GSOE has a cycle of inquiry and improvement, the students experience the same thing in their programs. The exit portfolio process is a natural extension to the course work and fieldwork activities.

### **2010 Team Findings for Education Specialist Program Standards 13, 18 and 21**

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervisors, the team determined that programs standards were met with the exception of three standards in both the Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe teaching and internship programs: Standard 13—Special Education Field Experiences with Special Population, Standard 18—Determination of Candidate Competence, and Standard 21—General Education Field Experience. These three standards were Met with Concerns.

Standard 13: There is limited performance data demonstrating candidate exposure and the ongoing development of competencies in serving diverse students with disabilities. Moreover, the graduated sequencing and documentation of field experiences, as required in Standard 13, is unclear. Verification of support to interns each semester needs to be documented. Finally, another concern is that traditional student teaching, typically a culminating experience, may be taken prior to the end of the program.

Standard 21: Each candidate should have a variety of field experiences in general education. These general education field experiences may be embedded in course assignments that can be individualized, but they are not readily apparent. Overall, there does not appear to be a systematic approach that focuses on the documentation of all supervision experiences.

Standard 18: Candidates in Levels I and II have a clear understanding of the program's summative method of evaluation at program completion. Key assignments are tied to courses in Level I and directly to the standards in Level II. Candidates are informed of and collect key assignments. Some of these assignments are randomly selected to evaluate teaching competency at the end of the Level I. In addition to an institutional supervisor, a field supervisor or site administrator needs to provide a summative assessment for interns. The current method of assessment does not clearly indicate a comprehensive and summative evaluation of a candidate's teaching competencies.

### **Touro University Response to Education Specialist Standards 13 and 21**

Tables and various attachments documented the following:

The response to Standards 13 and 21 will be combined, since the GSOE will be better able to show the comprehensive and complete nature of fieldwork for special education candidates in M/M and M/S, especially when dealing with diverse populations and general education. In response, the special education field experiences involve a broad spectrum of interactions. Since the site visit there have been several actions in regards to these standards.

1. A new professor has been hired in special education; this will help the counseling, advising, and oversight of credential candidates.
2. During twice a year advising sessions, the field experience component is reviewed and tracked.
3. Additional training has occurred with field work supervisors.
4. The field work director has met and articulated with the program chair for special education.
5. Special education rubrics and key assessments are being loaded onto TaskStream.

Within the Educational Specialist credential program there is a graduated sequence of interaction with diverse populations. Within the sequences of courses, the rigor, depth, and broad interaction are amplified. Also students are required to interview a parent as one of their assignments. This takes place in both the M/M and M/S credential programs.

At the same time, courses and field experiences are aligned and evaluated numerous times. Fieldwork/clinical experiences grow increasingly more involved and complex as candidates progress through the program. Field experiences are included in each of the three semesters and are designed to provide real-life experiences that correspond to classroom instruction. Thus, candidates move from the initial observation of various aspects of schools to the complexities of student teaching in a series of steps.

Credential candidates are exposed to field experiences that match the credentials they are working to earn. This exposure applies to school levels as well as subject matter. Special education intern candidates are supported in numerous ways and there are MOU's in place in regards to how interns are supported. Additionally the new preliminary Education Specialist credential will require the TPA to be completed. This will assure alignment in regards to the fieldwork and standards. Student teaching doesn't occur until the student works with their advisor.

Special education students are required to observe general education classrooms in different setting, write observations and reflections, and apply the teaching standards. Students are also given specific support and oversight in classroom environments when it comes to interacting in a general education setting. The assignments become more complex and interactive as classes progress and of course fieldwork allows for the comprehensive application of skills. Candidates are required to conduct an interview of a parent of a child with either Mild/Moderate or Moderate/Severe disabilities.

## **Touro University Response to Education Specialist Standard 18**

Tables and various attachments documented the following:

Each credential program has a layered and progressive approach to candidate assessments and competency. The TPE and educational specialist standards are taught many times in different classes and instruction is looped together from class to class. There is a summative component to each credential. There is a process in place to assure each standard is met. This is completed at the exit interview and is reviewed by more than one person.

Extensive fieldwork is required in all classes. In addition, fieldwork is required to meet the Level II competencies not met within the coursework. For example, a candidate may select an expertise area which requires fieldwork experiences beyond those offered in the coursework.

The Level II candidate's assessment process is composed of:

- The candidates' individualized induction plan (IIP)
- The candidates' professional portfolio
- Candidate self assessment
- Support provider/school district assessment
- University advisor assessment
- Observations of the actual classroom teaching by peers and faculty
- Education Specialist Checklist of Level II requirements
- Level II course completion and GPA in those courses.
- Other authentic assessments

Authentic assessment methods are also used to assess candidate competence. Assessment activities must include at least six methods for each candidate. The candidate, the school district support provider, and the faculty advisor choose the methods from the following list:

- Oral exit interview
- Written exit interview
- Peer coaching input
- Conference presentations
- Videotapes of candidate teaching
- Journal entries
- Written tests and examinations
- Term papers and other written texts
- Non-linear projects
- Original and creative work, or design of newsgroups, networks, etc.
- Parent letters and notes
- Letters of commendation from peers
- Written Summative Report of the induction plan

The design of the GSOE's special education teacher preparation programs completely integrates field experiences into every course and blurs the arbitrary boundary between coursework and fieldwork, between theory and practice. Fieldwork requirements are tied into course assignments

which are designed to be skill building activities that take place in the candidate's intern/student teaching placement.

Exit interviews occur for each credential. The student portfolio is evaluated by the candidate's advisor to assess required competences. Outside evaluators also review the portfolios. Input is taken from site mentors, fieldwork coordinators, and the program chair. A checklist is reviewed prior to a teacher obtaining a credential.